UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

The American Negro and the War - - - - - - *Karl M. Chworowsky*

A Humanistic Concept of Prayer - - - - - - - *Randall S. Hilton*

A Case Against False Jeremiahs - - - - - - - *Imanuel Allen*

Religious Humanism - - *Archie J. Bahm*

The Study Table

VOLUME CXXVIII NUMBER 6

Chicago, August, 1942

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Monthly *Subscription $1.50*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter, April 11, 1941, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Contributors

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian Congregational Church, Flatbush, New York.

Randall S. Hilton: Minister of the First Unitarian Church, Alton, Illinois.

Imanuel Allen: Formerly, teacher of religion in a Polish school in Poland, from which country he has recently come to live in the United States.

Archie J. Bahm: Professor of Philosophy, Texas Technological College, Lubbock, Texas.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Editorial—CURTIS W. REESE 83
Editorial Comments—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 84
Jottings—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 87

ARTICLES—

The American Negro and the War—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 87
A Humanistic Concept of Prayer—RANDALL S. HILTON 90
The Case Against False Jeremiahs—IMANUEL ALLEN 92
Religious Humanism Refined—ARCHIE J. BAHM 93

POETRY—

The Great Secret (Dedicated to George Washington Carver)—
LOLA BEALL GRAHAM 91
The True Man—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 94

STUDY TABLE—

A Race Marches Forward—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 95
Religion Around the World—C. A. HAWLEY 95
"The Cure of Souls"—EDWIN T. BUEHRER 95

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Jews and the Land—VICTOR S. YARROS 96
Forthright Statement—MADISON COOPER 96
Pleased Mightily—VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH 96
Many Good Things in UNITY—E. H. BARRETT 96
Agrees with Editorial—CYRIL K. RICHARD 96

THE FIELD—

A Self-Sketch of a Minister—CLYDE D. WILLIAMS 82

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

A Self-Sketch of a Minister

Your minister does not feel that he owns the world on Sunday. He does deplore the disordered mess that people often make of the "one day of rest in seven." He would prefer to call it a day of opportunity, when freedom from the exhausting grind might open new doors of personal discovery to anyone who could stay awake. But if people prefer to lounge around in pajamas and slippers, that is their own business. Nor would he attempt to drive young people into church by closing the places of amusement. Only those who come to church of their own free will can find anything helpful, or contribute anything valuable to the work of the free church. It is not inherently evil that the church should be faced with Sunday competition. What is evil is that the church should fail to meet such competition with imagination in using the opportunities that are open to it.

Your minister, like President Coolidge's parson, is "against sin." But he refuses to play the old, self-righteous game of catching sinners. He regards sin as something rather more involved than the old triad of "wine, women, and song." And he is much more inclined to apply the word to such disastrous modern habits as racial intolerance, personal irresponsibility in social life, and the self-deceit that allows us to believe vicious nonsense about our neighbors and ourselves.

Your minister does not believe in giving personal advice to anyone. And he refuses to do it, even when people ask him for it. He regards his fellow men, not as children who need to be told what to do, but as responsible adults who must decide for themselves. He is willing to spend any amount of time in helping people to learn to think for themselves.

But if any person feels the quite legitimate need of talking about his problems with a sympathetic listener, he will find the minister entirely at his service at any hour. Your minister has an ironclad code of ethics. He understands and honors the word, "confidential." And any personal confidences entrusted to him are locked up in an absolute safe-deposit, to which the man whose secret it is carries the only key.

Your minister is human. He is quite as capable as you are of making mistakes and, he hopes, of profiting in the future from the lessons learned in the experience. He strives always to remember that a person is greater than his errors; and in his relations with others he would seek the true self that is hidden behind every incomplete picture given by outward conduct. It is no easier for your minister to deal patiently with the petty annoyances of church life than it is for anyone else. But he knows, through long and chastening experience, that it is possible to rise above them by keeping one's mind fixed upon the great objectives of the church. In all his pastoral work and preaching, your minister would converse with the true minds and spirits of his people. It is a lofty goal, and he has many shortcomings. But he will not cease in his efforts to reach it.—Clyde D. Williams, in *The Columbus Unitarian Bulletin.*

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXVIII AUGUST, 1942 No. 6

EDITORIAL

CURTIS W. REESE

Many Americans do not yet fully realize that we are engaged in a war on a global scale. Even the talk of a "second front" tends to cause us to lose sight of the fact that there are now seven major fronts to which America is committed in one way or another.

The *first front* of this second World War is that of China, starting eleven years ago with the conquest of Manchuria by the Japanese and fought for the past five years with incredible skill and courage by the hard-pressed and poorly equipped forces of Chiang Kai-shek. Had the western democracies given China the aid she needed and deserved in years past, there might never have been a Pearl Harbor with its aftermath. But that is water under the bridge. The United Nations must and will give China all the help that is now possible; for the winning of the Chinese front is absolutely necessary for peace in our time.

The *second front* is that of Western Europe, centering chiefly in France. This front, together with its auxiliary lines, has been temporarily lost—lost first of all in Spain where the Loyalist government fought a single-handed battle against rebellion at home and hostile action from abroad; lost in Austria, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland, in the deep Balkans, in the lowlands, in Scandinavia, and, worst of all, in France itself. However, the battle is not yet over, but is still being fought from the air and perhaps it will soon again be fought on land; although it is debatable whether under all the circumstances this front should not be regarded as of necessity a battle primarily of the air. Had America abandoned the farce of neutrality at an earlier period, France might not have completely fallen and the banner of Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity might still be flying. Even the temporary loss of this front is one of the supreme tragedies of history. That it will be regained is certain, since on this depends the ultimate defeat of Nazi Germany.

The *third front* is that of the British Isles, where there has been written in "blood, sweat, and tears" an epic of unchallenged grandeur. After long delay America, finally realizing that her interests in this tragic world situation are one with those of Britain and that isolation is impossible, marshalled her forces and assumed responsibility in the maintenance of the British front. Shaken to its depth, battered with barbarous fury, the British line still holds.

The *fourth front* is that of North Africa, where the line has moved back and forth from the days of Mussolini's conquest of Ethiopia to the present battle of the desert. The United Nations must hold the North African front or allow the Axis powers to capture the Mediterranean, the Suez, and the Near East, not to mention the whole of Africa—thus insuring the continuation of the war for a decade or longer. The battle of the African desert is our battle and will be won or lost by our aid.

The *fifth front* is that of the long reaches of the Atlantic. Grave dangers to the life of America lurk in the Atlantic waters and crawl onto our shores or the shores of our southern neighbors. On this front the losses have been heavy—some four hundred ships having already gone down. Our very right to exist as a free nation is at stake in the battle of the Atlantic, and it must and will be won.

The *sixth front* is that of Russia. Had Russia struck while Germany was engaging the full force of France and Great Britain, the story would have been vastly different, but with Germany relatively free to move her forces to the eastern front Russia had to withstand one of the most severe assaults in history. Russia, like America, did not enter the fray until actually attacked, thus losing the strategy of the initiative; but once engaged Russia has won the admiration of the world with her power and courage. The Russian front is now a major concern of the United Nations and all possible force must be marshalled there as fast as ships can plow the mine- and submarine-infested waters and as fast as planes can leave the factories and take to the air. A Russian defeat would bring staggering repercussions throughout the world, prolong the life of the Axis, and multiply the difficulties of the United Nations.

The *seventh front* is that of the Pacific, stretching from Australia to Alaska. This front constitutes America's most immediately pressing line of defense and attack. Japan has shown undreamed of striking power, and we now know that she must be utterly defeated in her own waters and on her own shores before our Pacific coast can ever again be regarded as an area of safety. We "babied" Japan too long and must now pay for our folly.

The maintenance of all of these seven fronts is important. No one of them can be lost except at the peril of all the rest. This is no time to debate their relative merits. They must all be held; they must all be strengthened; they must all be won!

Editorial Comments

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

I

Special dispatches from Stockholm, Sweden, brought word last month of a remarkable sermon delivered in Berlin by the Roman Catholic Bishop of the German capital, Konrad von Preysing. This sermon, preached in honor of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the ordination of Pope Pius XII as bishop, was hailed with loud encomiums of praise by the American press. And rightly so, for the sermon was as brave as it was true! Straight in the face of the Nazi Fuehrer, the Catholic Bishop flung his defiance of violence, tyranny, and hate. But how many of the commentators who rejoiced at the enunciation of the preacher's sentiments in Berlin saw their application to America, or would support their application in this country? It is all right applauding truth abroad, but how about welcoming and living up to this same truth at home? Thus, the Berlin Bishop declared, to quote the headline in the New York *Times,* that "God is above the state."

> It is a fatal mistake [he continued] to believe that the state is the highest expression of divinity. . . . The rights held from God cannot be replaced by rights deriving from the state.

Fine!—that puts the Nazi government in its place. But how about the American government, and the right of the citizen to deny, in the name of God, that the state has a right to go to war, or to force citizens to fight in war? The United States has done well thus far in recognizing the religious right of conscientious objection to war, but as the war effort tightens and feelings tighten with them, it is well to be reminded by a German churchman in Berlin that "God is above the state," and obedience to God primary to obedience to the state. Again, Bishop von Preysing, in his Berlin pulpit, declared that the state must "recognize the right to give a religious education to children." Fine again! —the right of parents to educate their own children in the ways of their own religion, and accept no dictation from the government! We believe in that—in Germany! But how about our own country—and Jehovah's Witnesses, for example, in this country? The religion of these people involves the instruction of their children not to salute the flag, and for this offense they are punished here as definitely, though not at all as cruelly, as in Germany. Why? Again the German Bishop besought his listeners to "pray for love in the world—love for all, for friend and foe; yes, even for those who do not wish us anything but ill." Here spoke a true Christian! We must have "love for all," even our enemies, and those who wish us nothing "but ill." I can get no meaning into this except what it says, and what it says applies equally to our country and to Germany. We must have no hate—we must love all men—we must include within the range of our good will even "those who wish us ill," which surely means Germans. Let American churchmen preach this truth as bravely as this German Bishop, and we may get somewhere!

II

The war of retaliation and revenge is now loose upon us. England's terrific bombing of German cities has been met by systematic Nazi attacks from the air upon Exeter, Bath, Canterbury, and others of the loveliest towns in the British Isles. Uprisings in the occupied countries are punished by the Nazi shooting of helpless and innocent hostages on a scale to chill the blood. Rumors of the use of poison gas by the Nazis are countered by Mr. Churchill's threat to drench the German population with a fatal rain of poison from the skies. John Spargo, amid loud applause, has begged the President and the British Premier to announce their resolve to shoot, after the war, one German officer for every hostage slaughtered from now on by Nazi troopers. The ghastly wiping out of Lidice has led to the proposal that R.A.F. bombers wipe out a similar German village. Where is all this going to end? Where can it end except in mutual destruction? An article in the *Progressive* (June 27th) states the situation: "Our side will murder their innocents because their side murdered our innocents, and their side will murder more of our innocents and ours will murder more of theirs, and by and by it won't matter to anybody who started it because everybody's heart will be hardened and innocents will die and kill until we are all gone and the world is quiet." That is the logic of it, and the irony—that retaliation, like a shuttle, weaves back and forth a pattern of death and doom for all! It is a process of give-and-take which rolls itself up like a snowball,

until man is buried and lost in one vast round of horror. Strange, after all these years of futile revenge—"an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"—that no statesman has thought of trying to "overcome evil with good"! Evil, we now know, or should know, is never overcome with evil, but only magnified and extended thereby. So why not try an opposite method—that of fighting fire not with fire but with water? It could not fail any worse. It might succeed beyond all imagining. Indeed, it *has* succeeded long since, in the case of multitudes of humble men and women who have dared to live in the spirit of love and forgiveness. And it has succeeded on a larger scale, too, in group relationships, as witness the Quakers and the Gandhian movement in India. "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us"—there's the true law of retaliation! But the world, in this matter of injuries and death, is beset by the superstition that force can be met only by force, and hate only by hate. And so we reel on from one dire disaster to another, with death wreaking its own final vengeance upon us all.

III

It is to the glorious credit of the American people that the Japanese question on the west coast will not down. It haunts the conscience of the nation the way dead Caesar haunted Brutus in Shakespeare's play. Brutus had slain Caesar from good motives. He was seeking to save the Republic. Said Antony of him:

> All the conspirators, save only he,
> Did that they did in envy of great Caesar;
> He only, in a general honest thought
> And common good to all, made one of them.

Yet did Caesar's ghost pursue Brutus to the very eve of Philippi! So the American government, we may well believe, has rounded up the Japanese of the Pacific coast with the best motives of public safety—even of safety for the Japanese themselves. Yet the spectre of the deed pursues us! Particularly are we oppressed by the idea that we have done to the Japanese in this country only what in basic principle has been done to the Jews in Germany. This thought is expressed by Martha Sharp, representative of the Unitarian Service Committee, in an article in the July issue of the *Christian Register*. Describing the Nipponese-Americans whom she saw in Los Angeles "loaded into jeeps, busses, and Army trucks bound for Santa Anita," she writes that this sight "brought back sharply other scenes," as when at Oloron Saint-Marie, France, she "watched several thousand German Jews unloaded from a train to be carried away in trucks to the internment Camp de Gurs in the Pyrenees." The Quakers are beset by the same thought, as witness the statement of C. Read Cary, of the American Friends Service Committee, reported in the New York *Times* (June 19th), that in the case of the resettlement camps in California, "we are doing exactly the same thing as in Germany." The Roman Catholics are similarly haunted, as note the following quotation from a first-hand report in the June issue of the *Catholic Worker*:

> I saw a bit of Germany on the west coast... [in] some of the concentration camps where the Japanese men, women, and children are being held. . . . I have read a number of letters from Japanese girls to school-mates, from mothers of families to friends of ours. All speak of misery and bewilderment. "There are floodlights turned on at night," one letter said. A friend of ours in New York, a woman doctor who had been put in a German concentration camp, complained of just such a light which kept anyone in the prison camp from sleeping.

It is evident that we have an evil here to be corrected. Now that the initial excitement is over, there are signs that correction is beginning. With Unitarians, Quakers, and Catholics leading the van of protest, there may be good hope of action. "The time will come," writes Mrs. Sharp, "when officials will hear them [the internees], and send them out of the camps."

IV

The more the 5 to 4 decision of the Supreme Court in the Jehovah's Witnesses case on June 8th last sinks into the American consciousness, the more it becomes evident that this decision constitutes a blow struck straight at the heart of religious liberty. And of civil liberty as well, for, as the *Christian Century* well points out, "there can be no invasion of religious liberty which is not also an invasion of civil liberty"! This case, it will be remembered, upheld the validity of local ordinances requiring the licensing of all distributors of books and pamphlets. This means that any city, town, or village may impose a tax upon anybody who may desire to distribute or sell literature of any kind—upon Jehovah's Witnesses in their tract distribution, upon UNITY if it undertook (as the *Churchman* has done on occasion in New York) to sell copies on the streets, upon my church if it desired to dispose of copies of its minister's printed sermons! There is no limit upon the tax—it may be made prohibitive. There is no protection against discrimination—the license may be imposed upon Jehovah's Witnesses and Unitarians and not upon Roman Catholics, or upon Socialists, Communists, and Single Taxers and not upon Democrats and Republicans. One does not have to go farther than the tremendous minority opinion written by Mr. Justice Murphy to discover the significance and ultimate effect of this decision. A way has been found, says the Justice with the concurrence of three of his associates, including the Chief Justice, for "the effective suppression of speech and press and religion." Before this edict, constitutional guaranties are gone, and right here in our own country, at the moment when our sons are fighting and dying for the cause of freedom abroad, this cause is defeated. Of course there is nothing new in all this. It carries one straight back to 1664 and the publication of John Milton's immortal *Areopagitica* on behalf of the right of unlicensed printing. Un-

der the fiat of our Supreme Court, we are right now where John Milton started, with the fight for liberty to be fought over again. Fortunately, the country is awake on this issue. The newspapers, headed by the New York *Times,* are in revolt. The religious press, headed by the *Christian Century* and the *Christian Leader,* is lifting no uncertain voice in protest and alarm. The American Civil Liberties Union is leading a movement to gain a rehearing of the case. The cause of liberty is in danger, but it is by no means lost. Incidentally, it may be noted, for one more lesson in the ironies of history, that it is the reconstituted New Deal Court which passed down this decision, and that Felix Frankfurter was one of the majority!

V

It was a sobering experience to read the New York *Times* on July 13th last. On page 3 appeared a special wireless dispatch from London, nearly a column long, headed "Churchill 'System' Assailed by Laski." The dispatch quoted liberally from an article published in the *New Statesman and Nation* by Harold J. Laski, the well-known English economist and Labor Party leader. The main thesis of the article, states the dispatch, is that the root of the evil troubling England today is in Prime Minister Churchill's "system," which, says Laski, is "to promise anything that may be necessary for victory," but to accompany this promise with "assurance to the main beneficiaries of the old order that their privileges shall remain untouched." Laski goes on to say:

> Churchill is fighting to preserve the system now in being against the counter-revolutionary idea embodied in Hitlerism. His anxiety is to win it with men and with measures which do not touch the foundations of our society. If he can hold Hitler at bay till all the resources of America are fully mobilized he can count on victory which will make it unnecessary during the war to raise any of those controversial issues, a discussion upon which might disturb the status quo.

"The long series of disasters with which the [Churchill] government is associated," concludes Mr. Laski, is due to this attempt "to wage revolutionary war without revolutionary means. It is a necessary consequence of a government which seeks to revitalize a society that is dying instead of being urgent to hasten the birth of a society that is seeking to be born." This article is remarkable for two things: first, that it should have been published in England, and secondly that the *Times* should have chosen to republish it here in America. But this is not all! On the front page of this same July 13th issue of the New York *Times* appeared a special dispatch from New Delhi, India, headed, "Anti-British Move Is Adopted in India." The dispatch reported the sensational news that the All-India Congress Party's Working Committee had adopted Gandhi's program for a mass movement of moral pressure to compel Britain to give India full freedom at once. "The outcome," says the dispatch, "was a complete triumph for the seventy-two-year-old spiritual leader of Indian nationalism." It went on to state that Gandhi had "won over without reservation Pandit Jawarharlal Nehru." This means a resumption of the civil disobedience campaigns which Gandhi has led with such effect in the past, not however in such way as to interfere with the war effort. Britain has a choice of policies in this crisis—to grant the independence demanded, or to jail the Indian leaders and repress the popular movement. This action of Gandhi in India, coupled with Laski's protest in London, raises sharply the question as to whether a "system," to quote Laski, is going to interfere with a real winning of a war for freedom.

VI

The hope for England in this war lies in the unquenchable spirit of independent opinion among her people. Have we anything quite to compare with this here in America? Last month, for example, a highly responsible member of the House of Commons, belonging to the Conservative party, Commander R. T. Bowers, of the British Navy, stood up in his place and said that England is now face to face with one of the most desperate situations in her history, but that "the men who have botched and bungled almost every campaign so far ended, losing half the Empire in a few weeks, are still functioning unchanged." Have we any such spirit of free criticism as this in this country? On the contrary, if any one so much as peeps, there comes the instant cry that the administration must not be criticized lest we give aid and comfort to the enemy. Yet that Washington is not beyond criticism has been pointed out by no less eminent a journalist than Mr. Oswald Garrison Villard who, writing in the *Progressive,* says that "Washington is tied up tight with red tape, confusion, overlapping of functions, maladministration of all sorts and kinds . . . and no one is taking this seriously, least of all the President who is, as head of the administration, responsible for misgovernment." But, in England, it is only not only in the Commons but in the electorate at large that democracy is wide awake and outspoken. Thus, the bye-elections are going against Mr. Churchill, as note particularly the sensational defeat of a Tory-Liberal-Labor candidate in the Maldon constituency in Essex by an Independent candidate—a supporter of the war, and thus a non-pacifist —who ran "on his own." This constituency has been safely Tory for generations. In this particular election, the Prime Minister had himself intervened with a letter denouncing the "levity of mind" which inspired independent candidates to break the political truce and oppose the government. But when the people spoke with their ballots, they elected the Independent candidate, and thus defeated the Churchill supporter, by a vote of 12,219 votes against 6,226. This, says a United Press dispatch from London, passed by the censor, is a vote of "no confidence in the Churchill government."

Should there be a similar vote in this country, as regards the Roosevelt government, in the approaching Congressional elections? I am not raising this question. I am simply saying, and insisting, that the voters have themselves a right to raise the question. Yet a movement is under way to wipe out party lines this fall, and elect only men pledged to support the White House whether or no! This is a betrayal of democracy. For in America as in England, in war as in peace, the test of democracy is the right of opposition.

Jottings

Is there anything in this world quite so wonderful as turning on the radio and hearing the ether talk? Yes, there is one thing more wonderful, and that is turning off the radio and hearing silence for a while.

The campaign for scrap rubber, as a voluntary offering to the nation, was a good illustration of democracy at work in wartime. But was it fair to blame New York for giving only three ounces of rubber per person, whereas a little town in Arizona gave forty pounds per person? Most New Yorkers live in apartments, with no cellars, attics, backyards, or sheds. What room have they got to store away rubber, or any other commodity? Come, gentlemen, be fair!

It is rumored that there is a gentlemen's agreement between London and Berlin that these two seats of government shall no longer be subject to bombing. Such rumor is obviously untrue, for where would gentlemen be found among the Nazis to sign such an agreement?

The Quakers are an extraordinary folk. They seem to be able to do what others cannot do. Thus, it is stated by the *Worldover Press* that to this day in Germany the organ of the German Society of Friends, *Der Quaeker,* is being published, and that books issued by the Quaker publishing house at Bad Prymont are selling well. What does this mean?

I have just received an epistle in which throughout the word "church" is written with a small letter (church), and the word "nation" with a capital letter (Nation). It isn't difficult to place this correspondent, and to understand the nature of his religion.

The news of this war is certainly getting more alarming every hour. Here comes the news that, at the insistence of his generals, Adolf Hitler has given up his supreme command of the German armies. What could be worse than that for our cause?

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

The American Negro and the War

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY

The American Negro is today rendering a unique and invaluable service to the cause of world freedom and democracy. It is not at all unusual or surprising that the Afro-American should show himself ready and willing to defend his country and the larger cause of the United Nations, that he should volunteer for service in the armed forces at home or abroad, that he should be eager to take his place in the program of civilian defense or gladly assume responsibility in the council of peoples, planning and preparing for the post-war world. Herein, the American Negro is only doing what he has always done, namely, demonstrating that in his love of liberty and in his readiness to risk all in the service of mankind's highest ideals he is second to none. The American Negro has always been a loyal citizen and a patriot par excellence, and in these capacities he is today adding new luster to his brilliant record of the past. However, it does seem as though his white fellow Americans have not as yet fully appreciated the unique and inestimable service that the American Negro is rendering the cause of the United Nations in general and that of our own land in particular by insisting that *now* is the time for the white race to revise its estimate and treatment of the colored races, and that *now* is the time and opportunity, unmatched in the history of America, to remove from our national life those barriers and impediments that still stand between the black man of America and the complete unfolding of his powers and abilities as an American citizen.

When today the spirited and inspired words of Negro leaders from platform, pulpit, and press demand that full measure of justice, equality, and opportunity guaranteed the American Negro by the Constitution and assured him by virtue of his status as a free citizen of this commonwealth, our colored fellow citizen is thereby making a political, moral, and spiritual contribution to the cause of democracy and the new world order which white America and the rest of the white world are only too slow in recognizing.

It is, of course, to be expected that voices will be raised saying that this hour of grave emergency is not the time for any group to press its own demands, that all special interests must be merged in the war effort, and that all change and reform should await the more opportune time of peace. This may apply to interests that have little or nothing to do with the larger principles of democracy; this may be true of "privileges" aside from those that are part and parcel of free government and of the pattern of a free society. As regards the American Negro and his present demands for justice and equality, it can be said without exaggeration that what he now asks for are only those self-evident rights and those inalienable privileges which have been assured him ever since the days of the Emancipation

Proclamation and which, to the shame of his pale-skinned fellow citizen be it said, have never been granted him without restriction and discrimination. When today the Negro asks that America put her own house in order, that she assure democracy at home while fighting for it abroad, he is voicing a demand that every decent white citizen should support and enthusiastically endorse.

It should be most gratifying to every lover of freedom, to every champion of the American way of life, to every defender of democracy that the American Negro at this fateful hour of world history considers it not only his privilege but also his duty to stand firm *today* in his insistent demand that America, in asking for his devotion and loyalty in the defense of democracy here and abroad, make every honest effort to implement democracy at home. There is nothing hesitant or dubious about his claims; his speech is as forthright and brave as his demands are fair and just and as his cause is righteous. Instead of criticizing his courage and honesty, white America should welcome his uncompromising stand on moral and political fundamentals and should applaud to the echo words such as these spoken by one of America's leading Negroes:

> The Negro has come of age. He has reached the full stature of manhood. He knows that unless his protests are heeded, that though America might win the war, democracy will of a surety be lost. . . . America, you can't whip Hitler abroad without whipping Hitlerism at home.

These are bold and "patriotic" words from the new Negro who is utilizing a unique opportunity for voicing his claims for full recognition as an American and for complete participation in our national enterprise in war *and* in peace. With dramatic vividness, the American Negro is today bringing to the attention of his white fellow citizens a situation which mental sloth, spiritual indifference, and political corruption have allowed to develop in "the land of the free." Lincoln once said that a nation could not exist half slave and half free. It is equally true that a democratic people cannot exist half free and half half-free.

It is amazing with what lack of imagination and insight most white Americans continue to treat the problem of the black man in their midst. There seems to be prevalent a popular superstition to the effect that Lincoln's Emancipation Declaration in some magical manner made freemen out of slaves and automatically raised the American Negro to the status of full and unchallenged equality with his white fellow citizen. It takes little intelligence to appreciate the utter folly of such a view. Historic documents setting forth high principles of life and government never have had and never will have any such magical power. They are simply the expression of the will of the people in the interest of certain public policies, and without that will their noblest sentiments and highest ideals are bound to remain "sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal." The Bill of Rights and the Constitution of the United States were never conceived as types of political abracadabra which needed only to be put into writing and then to be chanted in order to work a quick change in the social order. Without the earnest will and devoted consecration of a purposeful people behind them, neither the Bill of Rights nor the Constitution would ever have produced a free America; the citizens of this land would still be enslaved and unfree had they depended for their freedom upon any political or economic magic residing in certain phrases and formulae. Similarly, the Emancipation Proclamation did not of itself set the Negro free. It may be said that all it did was to declare the intent and purpose of white America to cooperate with black America in an honest endeavor to atone for the past by giving to the American Negro the same status of dignity and privilege that was being enjoyed by his white fellow countrymen.

In this noble enterprise of cooperation for a fuller and wider interpretation and application of democracy and freedom in the American scene and for the benefit of a minority that has been so cruelly discriminated against, it has not been the Negro but the white American who has so signally failed. That after more than seventy-five years since the Negro has been politically and legally set free he is hardly anywhere in America wholly free and in only too many sections only half free, being everywhere subjected to forms of discrimination that are an insult to his citizenship and an injury to his native human pride, is a tragedy and shame for which certainly the Negro himself is not to blame. On the contrary, with a patience born of long centuries of suffering and pathetic tragedy, the Negro has "forgotten and forgiven" not seven times, but "seventy times seven times." Despite Jim Crowism in various forms, notwithstanding his restricted freedom in a free land, he has always been ready to serve his country in a time of need. And if today, in this hour of supreme moment for America and for the world, the American Negro says in the words of Countee Cullen, "One grows weary turning cheek to blow," if today he hesitates to serve until he be permitted to serve on equal terms with his white brother, he is neither to be blamed nor censured; he is rather to be praised and applauded, since he is acting and speaking like a true American, conscious of his birthright and high heritage as a citizen of a great democracy.

The white man's lack of imagination is further apparent in his failure to realize and evaluate the magnificent contribution that the Negro has made to the life of America. Blind and bigotted Americans are still asking by what right the Negro demands equality of privilege and opportunity. The answer might well be given in such simple words as "by virtue of his human rights and because of his birth into American citizenship"; but since this seems to leave white prejudice undisturbed, let us put it this way: "because of his amazing achievements; because of what the Negro has done for America." The glorious record of his contribution to the life and culture of America is there for anyone to read and to admire. Even while as slave the American Negro was bending his back and straining his muscles to help enrich our native prosperity, while he was laboring on plantation, in mine, and in our homes, he was already singing those songs and creating that poetry which will always remain an imperishable part of our national culture.

Since the day of freedom dawned for him more than three quarters of a century ago, the Negro has already covered himself with glory. The scientific laboratory knows his inventive genius; business, commerce, and industry know his skill and ability; education has called forth an amazing native adaptability and ingenuity, and in the arts and letters he has achieved triumphs which other and more fortunate minorities may well view with envy. In politics and government he has shown exceptional capacities, and in the larger realms of international relations, religion, and world problems he is proving that he possesses imagination and intuition, as well as practical wisdom and idealism. If anyone has

"earned" for himself the full measure of justice and equality in American life, it is the American Negro, and every decent white citizen of this land should be glad to know that the time has come when his colored fellow citizen refuses to be denied his inalienable and natural rights.

Our sorry lack of imagination as regards the position of our colored brother in our midst is not only a pathetic sign of spiritual blindness, of political immaturity, and of moral obfuscation, it may also at this particular stage of history prove a grim tragedy and lead to terrible retribution. It is being said in many well-informed quarters that western civilization is on the verge of disintegration; and there are voices who maintain that this civilization deserves to be destroyed if by no other token than the record it has made of its mistreatment of the colored races of the world. Today the Negro is but one of that vast majority of colored peoples who are rising in a new consciousness of their power and rights. Already the war has disproven practically every argument so glibly advanced by the white man regarding the alleged innate and natural inferiority of the colored man; already this war has shown that the white man alone cannot possibly defend and preserve those institutions of freedom and democracy which he so loudly boasts to have created and which in his pride and arrogance he has so regularly and extravagantly abused to the injury of his colored fellow man. If this war is won by the United Nations, it will be won because more "colored" than "white" blood has been shed on the battle fronts; it will be won not because of white "superiority" in production, in strategy, in heroic sacrifice, but precisely because, given a chance, the black man, the yellow, brown, and red man, can produce as well, can plan and lead as well, and can fight and suffer as heroically as anyone. If any ancient fallacy has been exploded by the TNT of recent events, it is the hoary superstition of the white man's superiority, the childish notion that there is something particular and special about a white skin beside the fact that it dirties easier and covers a tendency towards greed and exploitation.

When peace comes, when the new world is to be built, let us be quite sure of this: the new world cannot and will not be just a slightly retouched copy of the present world, a poorly disguised image of the status quo. Whatever this new world may look like, there will be no place in it for white superiority and pale-skinned superciliousness, for white imperialism, for white snobbery, for white prejudice. The colored people will claim their full measure of the world's goods, their share of power and control, their "place in the sun"; and if these are not granted them freely and liberally on the basis of their rights as sovereign nations and independent peoples, be assured that the next war will not be far off, and in this war—"the War of the Races," for generations the nightmare of the Caucasian—the white race, weakened and exhausted by corruption and internecine strife, will fall an easy victim to the vigor, the power, and the righteous fury of the colored races, whose irresistible tide no King Canute will dare to mock or oppose.

If we white Americans had both intelligence and imagination, we would let no opportunity escape us to make good *today* the crimes of our superciliousness, false pride, silly prejudice, foolish fears, and unpardonable ignorance. An old French philosopher has said, "When you know a man you cannot hate him." If we knew the Negro better, we could neither fear nor hate, suspect nor mistreat him. If we were morally intelligent and spiritually responsible, we would at once set into motion those forces of education and of government that can assure the black man in our midst within our own day his rightful place in the political, economic, educational, military, and social life of America. We would hasten to make amends, to heal the wounds, to atone for the sins of the past while we can do so with a minimum of disruption and painful adjustment.

The American Negro is today being asked to "do his bit" for the preservation of freedom and democracy in the world. It should not surprise us if, before joining enthusiastically in our war work, before giving himself whole-heartedly to production and civilian defense, he asks us very quietly and with complete justification, "*How* am I to fight, *how* am I to work for America? Am I being called to the colors, am I being invited to participate in this War for Freedom as a 'Jim Crow Nigger' or as an 'American Negro' whose black skin in no wise qualifies his rights, privileges, and opportunities as an American citizen?" White America will have to answer this question, not once but several million times, and it will have to answer it with honesty and with finality. The American Negro will not shirk his duty in this war; he will be in the thick of the fight, he will be among the most industrious of laborers in our factories, he will be an enthusiastic patriot for a free world and a democratic America, but his attitude will be, and should be, predicated upon the attitude of his white fellow citizens.

Today it lies with us, white Americans, to add an inestimable force and reservoir of power to America's war effort; it is in our power to bind to the great heart of our common America once and for all time the loyalty and devotion of the American Negro by freeing at last the amazing talents and capacities of this remarkable group of people, who, restrictions and discriminations notwithstanding, have for all these years shown themselves such devoted patriots and such adaptable and desirable citizens. Today, while the nation's resources, both of material and of human ingenuity and efficiency, are facing the supreme test in the crucible of war; today, when every ounce of physical energy and every atom of moral intelligence and spiritual enthusiasm are required to win the war; today is America's great hour of destiny, not only to demonstrate that her army and navy and air force can fight and win, not only to show that her institutions of freedom are still intact and functioning, but also, if not chiefly, to declare in word and deed that in this "all-out" effort to rid the world of tyranny and injustice there can be no place in this free land for any type of prejudice and discrimination based on race, color, creed, or previous state of servitude; today America faces the greatest challenge of her glorious history to implement in a final and consummate manner her creed of liberty, equality, and fraternity; today America faces the opportunity of showing not only that she *can,* but that she *will,* fight for the freedom of men everywhere by establishing first of all complete freedom and equality for all of her citizens here and *now;* and that means that every remaining shackle, inhibiting the choice and action of the American Negro, must be removed at once.

A prominent Negro leader in New York recently said:

We are fighting that there shall never be another nation

which shall be a colonial possession or an enslaved group. In the midst of the gathering darkness of this world chaos, let us labor on. Let us labor with the certainty that one day the dawn shall break when free men, black, brown, yellow and white, shall go forth to found a world culture in which all men shall live in complete equality of opportunity.

Will white America subscribe to these words by giving to this "dream" of a new world the immediate fulfillment that American democracy can provide?

A Humanistic Concept of Prayer

RANDALL S. HILTON

This is a concept of prayer which is derived from a point of view which has been called Humanist in religious philosophical circles. It makes no pretense of representing the concepts of others to whom the term "Humanist" has been applied. It is a purely personal concept which I think can and does logically result from a humanistic approach to life. I am offering no authority for my definition, concepts, and attitudes other than my personal experience, observation, feeling, and reasoning.

It is my purpose to approach this problem by asking four questions and trying to answer them. There is no sharp line of demarcation between them, in fact there is much overlapping. The order in which I shall deal with them is arbitrarily chosen for the sake of clarity in thinking and presentation. Underlying my answers are certain assumptions, some of which I shall voice and others which will be taken for granted as a part of the general humanistic philosophy of religion.

The four questions with which I shall be concerned are: 1. What is prayer? 2. What is the purpose of prayer? 3. How does prayer function as a group or public expression? 4. How does prayer operate as a personal experience?

Definitions, of course, are self-limiting. It is in this realm that one finds the greatest variance between theist and Humanist, and between Humanists themselves.

A theistic definition of prayer must *per se* include God. It is perfectly clear, however, that one's concept of God will have a definite bearing upon the content of the definition.

It is inconceivable to me that a person who has an orthodox, supernaturalistic theology could agree on a definition of prayer with a person who has a liberal theology and whose concept of God is expressed in scientific terms.

On the other hand, there are Humanists who refuse to use the term prayer. They would rather refer to the modern counterpart of that experience, which in the past has been called prayer, as meditation or aspiration. But it is my conviction that prayer has a unique and definite place in the life of man.

Meditation is primarily contemplative. It is a mental experience in which reason is the dominating influence. Aspiration, while it does allow for a greater balance between feeling and thought, is more often directed toward general goals, toward the achievement of the ideal.

Prayer includes both meditation and aspiration. It gives greater recognition to emotion than does meditation. And it gives greater recognition to the particular than does aspiration. Prayer is the process of correlating and integrating thought and feeling, reason and emotion, in relation to a specific problem.

This specific problem may be general, all-inclusive, all-encompassing or it may be narrow, particular, and exclusive. Further, whether the prayer experience is the result of the stimulus of reason or the impulse of emotion is of little consequence since it is a process of correlation and integration of both reason and emotion.

The only traditional term which I can apply to prayer is that of "sincere desire." Both of these terms "sincere" and "desire" have rational and emotional connotations.

Since for me prayer is the process of correlating and integrating reason and emotion in relation to a specific problem, it follows that the purpose is to achieve that mental and emotional correlation and integration which will result in the attitude and will to action necessary for solving the problem. I want to make it perfectly clear that it is not the solution to the problem.

Prayer does not control or direct external forces and factors involved in a given problem. Whatever influence it has is the result of the effect of the prayer experience upon the individual or the group.

In other words, it is the purpose of prayer to create a frame of mind, to bring about that discipline of thought and feeling, which will enable us to understand, to adapt, to utilize all of the forces and factors involved in the problem with which we are concerned.

If I may put it in another way, the purpose of prayer is to create the necessary unity for constructive and effective action.

Prayer as a group or public expression is usually confined within definite forms or patterns. It is conceivable that a discussion or forum could be a group experience of prayer. However, it is granted that it seldom is. Most frequently, if not almost always, group prayer is in reality public prayer. It is a definite part of a religious service or a formalized program. One person is designated to give a public expression of prayer for the group, or perhaps I should say, to the group. It is with this public expression of prayer that I shall deal primarily.

Some of my former fellow students described the prayers of the Dean of the University Chapel as "a conversation with the congregation with a loop-line through God." This rather humorous description is in reality a recognition of the fact that public prayer, even with a liberal theistic interpretation, is a definite attempt to bring about receptivity and an endeavor to create unified thought and feeling.

I once experienced a very vivid demonstration of this fact in a classroom at the University of Chicago. The class was composed primarily of graduate students most of whom were from the Department of Philosophy. All were critical and skeptical, if not cynical. The professor was Dr. A. Eustace Haydon, well known as a leader in the Humanist movement. He began talking about prayer, and a knowing smile and chuckle was the response of the class. Then Doctor Haydon

stepped in front of his table and said, "Let us pray," to be greeted by outright laughter. He started to pray and by the end of the third sentence the room was so silent that one could have heard a pin drop. He prayed for several minutes and said, "Amen." Complete quiet remained. In a moment Doctor Haydon said, "That, gentlemen, is prayer." Finally one of the most cynical found his voice and said, "No Doctor Haydon, that is hypnotism," to which Haydon replied, "Hypnotism—yes. But what is hypnotism but the unification of the individual mind around a single object. Prayer is the unification of the group mind around a single purpose."

In considering the nature and function of public prayer we cannot be unconscious of the personal element involved. The attitudes and convictions of the person performing the formalized expression definitely influence that expression. I have known theists, even liberal theists, who could conduct a worship service that was humanistic in every respect, with the one exception of their prayer. I am conscious of this in my personal experience. In the worship service of my own church a theistic litany precedes the prayer. But my prayers are invariably humanistic in both form and content.

The public expression of prayer is usually a form that is expected and missed if not present. It is in reality meditation or aspiration rather than prayer as I have defined it. To ascertain its results is very difficult, for the understanding and appreciation of public prayer is more often related to an aesthetic experience than it is to a genuine prayer experience.

I have already said that it was conceivable that discussions or forums could be group expressions of prayer. It is when there is a conscious attempt to achieve unified discipline of feeling and thought for the purpose of action. The reason it is not a common group experience is that most discussions or forums are conducted for the purpose of acquiring information or for the mutual exchange of prejudices, and not for the purpose of action.

The definition of prayer which I have given as the process of correlation and integration of reason and emotion in relation to a specific problem,—its purpose being to achieve an attitude for and will to action,—greatly increases the scope and nature of the personal experience of prayer. The necessity for a conscious assumption of the so-called prayerful attitude is eliminated. The use of traditional forms, phrases, or words is no longer necessary. Emotionally appealing clichés or catchwords, the utilization of creedal, doctrinal, or dogmatic mental concepts not only are not needed but are likely to prove a hindrance. All that is necessary is a conscious effort to acquire a personal orientation to a specific problem.

When this conscious effort exists, then there will be a genuine attempt to correlate and integrate feeling and thought, to discipline emotion and reason, so that conclusions may be reached which will provide unity and motivation for constructive action in solving the problem.

This process is equally applicable to the general and to the particular. It operates whether we are concerned with world peace or harmonious family relationships, whether striving to acquire a feeling of brotherhood for all men or to relieve the tensions of a particular friendship, whether we are confronted with the problems of relativity or a more efficient way of making a chemical compound or of combining ores.

This experience of prayer may take place in a church, at the office, in the laboratory, while turning a bolt on the assembly line, while riding on a train, driving a car, or sitting in an easy chair in front of the fire.

We need not be conscious that we are praying and we need not call it prayer. The name is unimportant, but the process is important. In fact there are many who will deny that this is prayer. But for me it is prayer and it is a common human experience.

This approach to the problem of prayer and the answers to the questions I have raised are frankly based on a naturalistic philosophy, a pragmatic analysis of traditional and non-traditional experiences, and are definitely functional in design.

You may ask then what is there religious about prayer. I will agree with you that in my concept not all prayer is religious. Prayer is religious only when its guiding principles are religious principles. And by religious principles I mean those humanly validated principles of love, affection, honesty, fairness, self-control, self-confidence, respect for others, integrity, sympathetic understanding, and search for truth. These are religious rules of conduct, guides to thinking, the measure of attitudes, and they encompass the range of feeling. They challenge with equal force both reason and emotion and can operate in our own lives and the lives of others with equal effectiveness.

When these principles are absent, prayer in any form is non-religious but when they are present, prayer is one of the noblest and highest experiences in man's quest for the good life.

Let us pray:

Conscious of the greatness and the glory that is ours, the power of our deep-seated emotions, the strength of our ability to reason, and the grandeur of our achievements, we would face our individual and common problems with courageous insight and quiet confidence.

Conscious of our smallness in this magnificent universe, the ever-present selfishness of our emotions and the incapability of our minds to comprehend all of truth, we would be humble seekers after truth, desirous of enhancing our knowledge and of disciplining our feelings.

May our wisdom be demonstrated by our poise and our open-mindedness.

May we strive to place honesty above cleverness, and integrity above personal advantage.

It is our sincere desire to learn, to understand, and to help each other so that hours spent together will enrich our lives and through us enrich the lives of others.—Amen.

The Great Secret

(Dedicated to George Washington Carver)

Love is the key, the secret key
  Unlocking every door . . .
Frees those entombed, those gone astray
  And those far, far from shore . . .
She plies the magic wand to weave
The wonder-worlds that we conceive!

Love turned the blackest infant slave,
  Without a family tie,
Into a man adorned by kings
  Who dare not pass him by;
This love unlocks each door with care
And up he walks the Golden Stair!

Though heir to all the world of wealth
  One could not buy this key.
It was designed and handed down. . .
  Passed on to you and me. . .
A key that will unlock each door
And set us free for evermore!

LOLA BEALL GRAHAM.

The Case Against False Jeremiahs

IMANUEL ALLEN

Of all the contemptible outbursts against the Jews, those of the misguided "Jeremiahs" are the most poisonous, because they serve as the sustenance on which the Goebels' and our native counterparts thrive. It is bad enough to read an attack on Jews in the misnamed *Social Justice,* but when a Jew is ignorant enough to slander his fellow Jews just because he came in contact with some unsympathetic members of his race, or because he loves publicity, he deserves the censure not only of his people but of all straight-thinking people.

Some neurotics, both Jews and Gentiles, believe that they have a divine responsibility to censure the Jewish people and lead them in the path of righteousness. But one of the unsolved mysteries of the world is why these nimble-witted "messiahs" do not enlarge on their *"mission civilizatrice"* among other ethnic groups. It is hard to believe that the Jews of all the divergent peoples inhabiting this otherwise comfortable celestial habitat are the only ones that are in such desperate need of spiritual guidance. Of the untold bales of paper and oceans of ink wasted to harangue the poor Jews, I challenge any one to show me a sensible approach to the problem.

All journalistic pencil-pushers with an intuitive social consciousness display a highly hysterical frame of mind. Most journalistic preachers with a social message lead the world to believe that anti-Semitism is some kind of incurable disease that cannot and will not be eradicated. Some attribute this to the fault of the Gentiles, who do not and cannot seek a rapprochement with the Jews, because the latter are "different"; while others ascribe it to the fault of the Jews to adjust themselves to the Gentile world.

The Jews are different from the rest of the people in the same proportion as Poles, for instance, are different from the Irish. The Jew is a component part of the country in which he lives and partakes of its manifold functions. The fact that the Jew in some cases dresses differently and/or observes his religion in a somewhat different form does not alter this fact, just as the fact that an orthodox Greek Catholic, for instance, performing his religious functions according to his ritual does not put a stigma on his loyalty to his country. The mode of living in the Orient is decidedly different from that of the Occident, and yet all the world does not castigate an Oriental.

As I pointed out above, there is nothing mysterious about a Jew. He has nothing to hide, and nothing to be ashamed of. Neither has he particular reason to be proud of his origin. Just like a Pole or a Czech or an Anglo-Saxon, or, yes, even a German, he has his faults and his good points. He has his heroes and his slackers, his scientists and his thieves. Any Jew who proudly harps on his scientist and public benefactor, and denies the undesirable elements in his midst, is a coward. The Jews are neither saints nor devils. They are just like any other people. They are serving their country and dying for it whenever they are called upon to do so. Jews as such do not have to be super-patriots. They have the same rights and the same duties as the other groups in their countries. To say otherwise is to play directly into the hands of Hitler, Hito and Company.

Our friends advise us to take stock of our plight. They advise us to "cleanse" ourselves of the "bad habits" and "adjust" ourselves to the outside world. Why only the Jews, and not the Irish or Italians? You never hear an intelligent Italian defending his people against Capone or Mussolini because they are gangsters. Nobody expects all Italians to be Dantes or Garibaldis.

Anti-Semitism is not a movement based on scientific facts. It is not a mass movement at all, the contentions to the contrary notwithstanding. It serves as a convenient vehicle to spread dissension. The origin of anti-Semitism is the same as that of anti-Negro, anti-alien, anti-Catholic, and anti-Labor propaganda. They all serve reaction and those who hate the democratic way of life. They are led by the Hitlers, the Coughlins, the Pelleys, the Moseleys, and all actual or potential traitors who, like the Quislings and the Lavals, do not hesitate to sell their country to foreign invaders for a price.

Hitler adopted an anti-Semitic policy not because, as he claims, of an aversion towards Jews; not because Rosenberg convinced the Nazis that the Jews are responsible for the plight of the Germans after the war of 1914. They know precisely what they are doing. They need the Jews as a cloak to hide their bestial regime.

Getting back to the discussion of anti-Semitism in America, I do not say that it is non-existent. All or nearly all native Fascist, semi-Fascist, and fifth column organizations that would like to see this country, together with our Allies, swallowed up by the Axis, carry an anti-Jewish, anti-Negro, and anti-democratic plank in their program. Their following, however, is infinitesimal.

The American people are imbued with the philosophy of religious and racial equality and are not easily swayed by professional hate peddlers. Here and there you find an ad that "only white Gentiles need apply," or a sign "Christians only." There are firms that ask your religion, and whether you are native or foreign born—questions that have no place in a conglomerate democracy such as ours.

There is no reason to get hysterical. We have overcome worse plagues, and we shall conquer these also. Admittedly, they are dangerous to our security and should be dealt with sternly.

Some of our apologists accuse Jews as a whole, not Jews or a Jew, of trying to deny their origin. This is frank libel. There are some that do, but to accuse the whole Jewish people of it is nonsense. Those who tell us to go back to the Ghetto are playing into the hands of our enemies. Besides, even if we did it would not silence our enemies. All that the Jews have to do is to serve their country to the best of their abilities, to the end that the democratic way of life shall be triumphant everywhere.

The contention of our false prophets that Jews know that "their number is up" is false and it is a libel on our democracy. It is not true as long as our form of government is based on the Declaration of Independence, which proclaims "that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

Religious Humanism Refined

ARCHIE J. BAHM

Responding to a long-felt need for religious reconstruction, a group of left-wing Unitarians, professors of philosophy, and other liberal thinkers organized, little more than a decade ago, the movement known as "religious Humanism." In its 1933 May-June issue of *The New Humanist,* the infant organization decided to put on long pants and issue "A Humanist Manifesto." Reprints of this Manifesto recently made available have an explanatory note:

> It was an endeavor to formulate the religious philosophy generally known as Humanism without setting up a final dogma. More recently the desire expressed by some to revise this statement led to coast to coast consultation among Humanists. . . . The result was the conclusion to leave the Manifesto unchanged, and, as originally intended, a dated document representing a sounding of views taken at a particular time of a movement which has always been kept self-critical and in a state of flux. Plans are now under way for the development of a new statement supplementary to the Manifesto. If any revision of the Manifesto appears, therefore, it will not be representative of the Humanist movement.

This article is not an official statement, but merely one Humanist's understanding of the essence of Humanism. It is written with the belief that the views herein expressed, or something like them, eventually will be considered official. The Manifesto said too much. Modern religious movements, like political parties, must not commit themselves on too many issues, be too specific in their doctrines, if they expect a broad range of adherents. The motives and spirit of the writers of the Manifesto were well-grounded in basic trends in our contemporary cultural milieu. But they wrote hastily. The time was ripe for reconstruction in religion and, crouched under violent criticisms of conservatives, they courageously stated, and overstated, their case. Surely those who see with perspective through time will praise their courage and forgive their inconsideration. After more than a decade of criticism and self-criticism, after more than a decade of observing their reflection in the changing mirror of other religions, science, and politics, they themselves are among the first to recognize Humanism's need of refinement.

Not all fifteen parts of the Manifesto are really essential to Humanism. Accuracy requires abbreviation. If Humanism is a religion, then, as a minimum, it must have those characteristics which are essential to religion. Thus it involves a view of values and of their conservability, a desire to conserve and to create values, faith that they can be conserved and faith in certain specific ways to conserve them, and action, shared action, in conserving them and creating them in what is called the "good life." Humanism differs from other religions chiefly in that its metaphysical influences come from the science of today rather than from the science of yesterdays, and, as a consequence, in that it stresses the locus of responsibility for salvation and conservation in human beings rather than in God. It is a somewhat humiliating doctrine in that it accepts this responsibility as wholly human, yet it is a proud and optimistic doctrine in that it expresses faith in human ability to succeed eventually in achieving at least a better life. Even under uncertainty concerning the existence of God, or in absence of belief in God, or in absence of existence of God, religiously-sanctioned human hope is possible. Even under growing uncertainty of the ability of science to state conclusively either the nature of the universe or of man, religious faith in the services of science can be maintained—despite some fear that machine-civilization now seems self-destructive. Humanism is an expression of and a living in the faith that human beings can accomplish ideals of human brotherhood with or without faith in the "fatherhood of God."

The purpose of this article is not so much to say what Humanism is as to say more precisely what Humanism is not. Humanism is more significant for its omissions than for its commitments. Many critics misinterpret omissions as negations. The vigorous language of the Manifesto tends to foster such misinterpretations. The need for more care and precision in stating the humanist viewpoint has become obvious.

Humanism is not atheism and Humanism is not theism. Belief in the existence of God is not essential to Humanism. Many thereby hastily conclude that Humanism is atheistic. But neither is the belief that no God exists essential to Humanism. Humanism does not find its excuse for being in either a theological or mechanistic framework. Its ground is human need. The quest for the good life has gone on, goes on, will go on, regardless of what metaphysical, political, or economic philosophies happen to prevail. One may be either a theist or an atheist within the framework of Humanism, so long as he conceives such views as secondary in importance and of significance because they better serve human needs. If a man believes that being a theist or an atheist makes him a better Humanist, then, on humanistic grounds, he is justified in such belief. The difference between a theistic Humanist and a humanistic theist may seem slight. Which of these one is depends upon which of the following one believes to have prior place: belief in God is good because the belief serves human welfare, or service to human welfare is good because it is service to God.

Humanism is not naturalism and Humanism is not supernaturalism. Humanism includes (1) those who believe that there are no supernatural beings, (2) those who believe neither that there are nor that there are not, and (3) those who believe that there are, provided such beliefs be considered not essential to their Humanism. Some Humanists are naturalists. Some of these seem at times to insist that naturalism is essential to Humanism. But whether one is a naturalistic Humanist or a humanistic naturalist depends upon whether he prefers to base his naturalism upon or within his Humanism or to base his Humanism upon or within his naturalism. Such supernaturalism as can find its justification in service to human need can be as congenial to Humanism as other alternatives. The present trend toward naturalism may becloud, but should not be permitted to exclude, the humanistic possibilities of supernaturalistic Humanism.

Humanism is not communism and Humanism is not capitalism. Many Humanists are avowed socialists. They conceive capitalism as a curse to the conservation and creation of widespread human values. Zealousness for an end through certain means tends toward hasty identification of means and end. Such hastiness is harmful to Humanism. Humanism is consistent with any type of political program which makes for maximum human welfare. The rising sun of socialism shines brightly in Humanists' eyes, but they should not permit

this to blind them to possible virtues of a capitalistic Humanism which in some historical cycle may resurge as the most satisfactory expedient. Spiritually, Humanism seems more akin to communism than to capitalism, as these appear at present, but the kinship is kinship of convenience, and Humanists should be willing to board wherever they fare the best.

Humanism is not pacifism and Humanism is not militarism. Probably most Humanists believe that human welfare can be achieved best by purely peaceful means, and that such means should be used. Yet, whenever it seems that the most intelligent solution to a particular social situation requires war, Humanists will choose war. While Humanists seek to foster faith that war is folly, when war is a fact, it is foolish not to face it. For Humanism, either militarism or pacifism may find justification when it seems most suited to serve the cause of human welfare.

Humanism is not nationalism and Humanism is not internationalism. Humanists tend to sympathize with human aspirations of all peoples. They tend to believe that the ideal life will be one in which the desires of all peoples will be satisfactorily adjusted. However, Humanism is not essentially committed to any type of political organization. So long as nationalism seems to serve human welfare better than internationalism, Humanists will be nationalistic. When internationalism seems to serve human welfare better than nationalism, Humanists will be internationalistic.

Many other pairs of opposites might be added to the above five. Mention may be made merely of a few. Humanism is not essentially either teleological or ateleological, mechanistic or vitalistic, finitistic or infinitistic, democratic or totalitarian. Humanists of different times and places may consistently choose different alternatives because both ideals and practicalities of different social situations demand differences in perspective. Whoever would deliberately and dogmatically define Humanism merely in terms of one humanistic perspective is an enemy of Humanism. The original signers of the Manifesto did not deliberately delimit Humanism, but it has become apparent to many that the limitations of their particular perspectives did unduly delimit its depth and breadth of appeal. Humanism has outgrown its first pair of long pants and is ready to be fitted for a new suit. But if the growing youngster be fitted too soon, it may soon again outgrow its new fitting. If the movement is endowed with sufficient intellectual wealth, perhaps it can be refitted often, each suit more suitable, more becoming, more attractive.

The essence of Humanism is like a theorem which has corollaries. Some corollaries can be derived only by assuming certain conditions which the theorem itself does not presuppose. The Manifesto included many corollaries based on conditions obvious only from certain perspectives. To refine Humanism is to state its essential theorems without deriving all, or any, of the corollaries derivable from different perspectives. Even though Humanists today may tend to agree upon naturalism, socialism, internationalism, democracy, yet this is not because those are parts of the essence of Humanism but because today's Humanists are products of similar cultural conditions.

Humanism may be considered a new dimension in religious thinking. Most religions tend to be tied to certain metaphysical presuppositions. If these are found false, adherents feel that their religion has failed. But Humanism is faith freed from the finalities of any specific metaphysics. Being tentatively tied to the scientific outlook of the day, it is subject to such shifts in perspective as science is likely to produce, and it is free even to flee from the myths of science whenever they seem to stifle rather than to serve human spirits. This freedom of Humanism from dictates of metaphysical, political, and economic specificities may help justify its claim to potential religious leadership. If religion essentially unites people with, and within, the world, then Humanism's freedom from metaphysical trifles which torment small minds provides a sort of unifying tolerance of which most religions are incapable. Only if Humanists can maintain permanent possibilities of plurality of perspectives can Humanism hope to survive or to succeed in serving the world's need for religious unity. Let us anxiously await our opportunity to witness the next suit in which Humanism will be dressed when it takes its next bow before the world.

The True Man

The forces of the universe are at work
Creating the man in whom all Nature can rejoice,
The man who will be coordinate with the completeness of things—
The true man.

The true man—the man of universal mind—does not actually exist.
He is as yet barely conceived,
At best we have only a dim perception of what he is to be.

You and I are not the true man.
We are only the womb in which he is being generated.
We contain the raw material and essential substance of his being.
It is within our power to become the elemental and vital progenitors of the true man.

However great we are, or think we are,
Or to whatever greatness we aspire,
At most we possess within us only the component elements
Of what eventually will become the true man.
We can make our life worth while only by helping to create and establish the needful conditions for his advent.

Some inkling, some intimation, some conjecture,
Some prophetic apprehension of what the true man is to be
Must somehow lay hold upon us,
Must tremendously grip our soul,
Else what we are as individual units of being
Can have no comprehensible significance.
If this germ does not somehow germinate within us
Our existence is at best a melancholy and meaningless affair
And our life becomes a pitiful abortion.

VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH

The Study Table

A Race Marches Forward

AMERICAN NEGROES: A HANDBOOK. *By Edwin R. Embree. New York: The John Day Company. $1.00.*

Here is a book which ought to have the widest possible circulation. It is well planned and well written, and it condenses into seventy-nine pages an amazing amount of solid information. All these virtues take on added importance because of the immediate necessity of getting the Negro problem burned into the conscience of the American people.

The American Negro is something new in the world. When the slaves were brought here from Africa they came from tribes as different as the several nations of Europe. Among them were Moors from the northerly coasts, Yellow Hottentots from the south, Bantu tribesmen from the equatorial regions, and still many others from areas in between.

Moreover, many African tribes were far above barbarism. Settled farming, exchange for goods and the use of money, organized governments, elaborate religious forms, beautiful arts and crafts,—all these were common over areas from which most of the slaves came. And since coming to our shores they have mingled with whites and Indians, as well as with one another—emerging, as it were, into a racial status entirely their own.

The bulk of our Negro population is still concentrated in the South; but since 1917 there has been a steady movement northward. There are 458,000 Negroes in New York City; more, for example, than in the entire state of Kentucky or of West Virginia. There are eleven American cities, most of which are in the North, with a Negro population of 100,000 or more. Increasingly, American industry is dependent upon them for its vast enterprises. The stockyards employ about 15,000, most of them in Chicago and Kansas City; and Henry Ford alone has about 9,000 Negroes working for him.

Negroes are entering the professions at an increasingly rapid rate. Today there are 4,000 Negro physicians, 2,000 dentists, and 6,000 nurses. Moreover, there are a few excellent schools and hospitals where they can be trained. Two medical schools are graduating 70 Negro physicians every year.

It is generally known, now, that Negro education is looking up. At the time of the emancipation 95 per cent of the Negroes were illiterate. Today about 15 per cent are illiterate. North Carolina, which one hundred years ago forbade by law the education of Negroes, today appropriates $7,000,000 annually for their education.

In every realm of life Negroes are distinguishing themselves; and in the musical arts, particularly, are we indebted to them. Embree points to the inconsistency of honoring such outstanding Negroes as Marian Anderson, Paul Robeson, Richard Harrison, and others, for their great personal accomplishments, and then discriminating against them along sharp racial lines. "Half Nazi, half Democrat," he says, pointing to our treatment of the Negro in a land which boasts of its love of democracy.

Embree knows the Negro problem, and he is not under any illusion about the long, hard road still ahead of us; but he sees hope in the steady gains that have been made. One cannot read this book without saying to oneself that these gains must be expanded and accelerated until Negro rights, every one, have been achieved and established.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

Religion Around the World

A DIGEST OF CHRISTIAN THINKING. *By Charles S. Macfarland. New York: Fleming H. Revell Co. $1.50.*

This is the fifth annual volume in Doctor Macfarland's admirable series of reviews and judgments on current religious thinking. Probably no man in America is more competent for this important task than Doctor Macfarland whose work with the Federal Council of Churches keeps him constantly in touch with every movement both in America and in the church beyond the seven seas. As a student in Europe he knows the moods and ways of that troubled continent whose writings he so well interprets and brings to us. And this is important right now. There ought to be some agency to keep us constantly in touch with the important writings coming out of Europe and Asia in this time when communication is so difficult. In the present volume the religious literature up through 1941 is carefully reviewed and evaluated. Judaism, Roman Catholicism, and Protestantism are all represented. A note of optimism runs through the book, and the author concludes thus: "So especially I say to the ministers of this generation, begin as I did this book, with God, and whatever may be the tragedies that surround us in the evening of my life, with me, you may end with 'the Unquenchable Light.'" This is a must book for all who are even remotely interested in religion as it appears around the world.

C. A. HAWLEY.

"The Cure of Souls"

GETTING DOWN TO CASES. *By Charles T. Holman. New York: The Macmillan Company. 207 pp. $2.00.*

For over a decade now, Protestant ministers have been intrigued, not to say excited, with the vast possibilities of personal counselling. With the confessional relegated to the past, the old question haunts us none the less: "How can we help people who get into trouble, and who do not know the way out?"

The author of this book literally gets down to cases. Here is an irresponsible wife, a gangster, a wayward daughter, a grief-smitten husband. Each case is followed through objectively, from beginning to end, indicating how a minister in each instance undertook to analyze the problem and to assist in the healing process. In some cases the cure was certain and permanent; and in some cases it was highly unsatisfactory.

All this is definitely in praise of Doctor Holman's book, for it would be disastrous if seminary professors

would begin to tell their students that their criterion of success will be their ability to give saving advice to all and sundry. But remembering what some authors of such books have claimed for their new technique of the ministry, one wonders how far this growing movement in behalf of personal counselling will go, and what the net result will be.

Certainly, no minister can be an expert psychiatrist, or even a semi-expert, and still organize his parish effectively and preach sermons which are worth listening to on Sunday morning. And Doctor Holman lays down heavy requirements for seminary students. They sound fair enough if one grants certain current premises regarding the need and the possibilities of personal counselling, but they sound impossible when one thinks of the all-round demands on the ministry. One "will need a *thorough* grounding in the psychological and social sciences"; one needs to be *"thoroughly informed* with regard to the insights and techniques developed by such disciplines as social case-work, mental hygiene and psychiatry. . ." and so forth. Clinical experience is necessary, and one must *"thoroughly understand"* and know how to "utilize the vast resources that are available in religious faith, fellowship, and practice for the development and rehabilitation of personality." (Italics mine.)

All of which is a big order, and any candidate for the ministry may well ponder whether he is willing or able to pay the price. Nor is that all. Interminable and repeated interviews are absolutely essential when one really gets down to cases, for a full and free confession is a catharsis for the patient's soul; and recovery is often a slow and painful process, even with wise and loving and time-consuming helpfulness by the minister.

Is it unfair to ask how many such cases one minister has time for? And how much expertness in this vast new field he can develop without bringing disaster upon his larger church program? If the present interest in personal counselling culminates in the emergence of broader social techniques on which the church can draw, and institutions to which its patients can be referred, then all our present literature on the subject will be justified. But only then. Meanwhile we should do well to know all we can, and do all we can about the problem of personal counselling, remembering full well the danger of committing ourselves to psychiatric pretensions which we cannot live up to.

EDWIN T. BUEHRER.

Correspondence

The Jews and the Land

TO UNITY:

Mr. Schwartz's letter in reply to my article on anti-Semitism in UNITY for May is no reply at all. I did not claim to have found "the" answer to the grave and tragic problem dealt with in that piece. There is no single, simple, sovereign solution of that problem. I ventured to submit a suggestion in the hope and belief that, if acted upon by a considerable number of Jews in any and all countries that do not deliberately bar that suggestion by law and policy, *one* of the counts in the long, self-contradictory and generally hollow and insincere indictment of the Jewish group by the anti-Semites—a count for which a substantial basis unfortunately does exist—would lose most of its force and validity.

Mr. Schwartz says nothing in his reply to affect the point or suggestion. The Jews, he admits, "if permitted to colonize," would do as well as any other ethnic group on or with the land. Well, in the United States, in Latin America, in Great Britain, in France, and even in Germany under the constitutional monarchy, the Jews *were* permitted to buy and cultivate land. They have not improved that opportunity. This was a blunder, and a serious one. It has put a dangerous weapon in the hands of the more vicious and cunning of the anti-Semites.

To affirm that Jewish farmers would not escape the hostility, discrimination, and persecution to which the Jews have been, and are, subjected almost everywhere, is to indulge in mere surmise and assumption. In the long run, it is reasonable to suppose, the cultivation of the land by intelligent and successful Jewish farmers could not fail to make the right sort of impression on the more open-minded and thoughtful Gentiles.

There is significance in the fact that Vienna mobs, after the Hitler rape of Austria, forced professional, cultivated, and well-dressed Jews to scrub and clean steps, halls, and water-closets. The inflamed mob had been told that Jews dislike and shun manual labor, and its impulse when legal and moral restraints had been removed by the brutal Nazis, was natural enough. The behavior of the mob was shocking, but it is certain that hosts of tolerably self-respecting Austrians secretly sympathized with it. And that is a challenge not to be lightly pooh-poohed.

Anti-Semitism will yield very slowly to reason, to the sentiment of justice, and to the spirit of humanism. The Four Freedoms will *ultimately* solve that problem no doubt but why not take thought and eliminate one grievance that is undeniably well-founded?

La Jolla, California. VICTOR S. YARROS.

Forthright Statement

TO UNITY:

The special editorial by Curtis W. Reese in the July issue of UNITY is a very forthright statement and I commend it. He has a practical grasp of the war situation which few editors can claim.

My own opinion is that the chief weakness of the Allies up to this time has been lack of generalship. We have too many parlor boys and socialites at the head of the troops, but it has always been that way with this great American republic. Generals must be developed and not made by official pronouncement.

Calcium, New York. MADISON COOPER.

Pleased Mightily

TO UNITY:

The last number of UNITY pleases me mightily—Mr. Reese's editorial and Mr. Patton's article "The Social Man."

Trout Creek, New York. VICTOR E. SOUTHWORTH.

Many Good Things in UNITY

TO UNITY:

I was pleased to see my criticism of UNITY in the July issue, but more pleased to see the editorial by Curtis W. Reese. I trust that you will keep up the good work.

The article by Mr. Yarros suits me very nicely, but "The Social Man" by Mr. Patton is a flaming message to a world wandering in the mist and darkness of our dark days. It is only in the society of our fellow human beings, that the full life of truth and beauty can be realized.

The many good things that are in UNITY make it necessary for me to have the invigorating tonic every month.

Lansing, Michigan. E. H. BARRETT.

Agrees with Editorial

TO UNITY:

The editorial by Curtis W. Reese in the July issue of UNITY is excellent. I count it the best statement by any religious leader made thus far during the war. It could well be the rallying point for many other like-minded ministers.

I warmly share this position, and urge him to make himself heard wherever possible.

Chicago, Illinois. CYRIL K. RICHARD.